



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,613	02/05/2004	Michael Kovacs	ORACL-01301US1	5069
80548	7590	10/15/2008	EXAMINER	
Fliesler Meyer LLP 650 California Street 14th Floor San Francisco, CA 94108			MUHEBBULLAH, SAJEDA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2174		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		10/15/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/772,613	KOVACS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SAJEDA MUHEBBULLAH	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 7/29/08.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed on 07/02/2008.
2. Claims 1-30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 15, and 21 have been amended and claims 29-30 are added. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 21, 23-25, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kemper et al. (“Kemper”, US 6,804,682).

As per claim 1, Kemper teaches an interactive tool for manipulating at least one deployment descriptor, comprising:

a first user interface capable of rendering a hierarchical representation of the at least one deployment descriptor, wherein a component of the representation can be selected by a user (Fig.4, 471; col.10, lines 1-12);

a second user interface capable of rendering a user-editable representation of the selected component (Fig.4, 481; col.10, lines 24-33);

a builder component capable of organizing deployment information from all of an application's deployment descriptors into a logical hierarchy of resources (Fig.4, 471), wherein the hierarchical representation of the at least one deployment descriptor includes a logical representation of application resources (Fig.4, 475), wherein each one of the at least one deployment descriptor describes run-time parameters particular to a given web server implementation, configuration information for application objects (col.13, lines 49-66).

As per claim 2, Kemper teaches the interactive tool further comprising: a third user interface capable of rendering an error message (col.10, lines 13-18).

As per claim 4, Kemper teaches the interactive tool further comprising:
a parser capable of generating a representation of the at least one deployment descriptor (col.13, lines 35-37);
a generator capable of creating the at least one deployment descriptor (col.13, lines 49-62); and

a validator capable of validating the at least one deployment descriptor (col.13, lines 38-41).

As per claim 5, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein the validator is capable of generating an error when it encounters a syntactic or semantic fault in the at least one deployment descriptor (col.10, lines 13-18).

As per claim 6, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein: the builder component is further capable of automatically updating the at least one deployment descriptor to reflect one or more changes in at least one source code file (col.22, lines 23-24).

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 2, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 23-25 are similar in scope to claims 4-6 respectively, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 28, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein the interactive tool is capable of automatically repairing a first deployment descriptor of the at least one deployment descriptors if the first deployment descriptor is defective (col.22, lines 23-24).

As per claim 30, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein the builder component is further capable of creating a master tree data structure that represents the present state of all deployment descriptor files (col.13, 32-62; col.22, lines 43-60);

invoking a generator to create a new tree data structure that represents deployment descriptor information based on the current state of source files in an application's project directory (col.14, lines 38-43; col.23, lines 29-53);

comparing the master tree data structure with the new tree data structure (col.14, lines 50-58; col.23, lines 54-63); and

refreshing the master tree data structure based on the new tree data structure (col.14, lines 58-67; col.23, line 64-col.24, line 7).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 8-12, 14-18, 20, 22, 27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper et al. (“Kemper”, US 6,804,682) in view of Chan et al. (“Chan”, US 2003/0028364).

As per claim 3, Kemper teaches the interactive tool of claim 2 wherein an error message is rendered (Kemper, col.10, lines 13-18). However, Kemper does not teach wherein user selection of the error message can cause the second user interface to render a user-editable representation of the at least one deployment descriptor component that is in error. Chan teaches an interactive tool for manipulating a file wherein an error message and the associated position of the error is displayed (Chan, para.0036). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Chan’s teaching with Kemper’s tool in order to locate the error quickly.

As per claim 8, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein the at least one deployment descriptor can be expressed as JAVA (Kemper, col.8, line 32). However, Kemper does not teach the deployment descriptor to be expressed as an Extensible Markup Language document. Chan teaches an interactive tool wherein the deployment descriptor can be expressed as an Extensible Markup Language document (Chan, para.002). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Chan’s teaching with Kemper’s tool in order to accommodate other types of files.

Claims 9, 15 and 22 are individually similar in scope to claim 3, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 10 and 16 are individually similar in scope to claim 4, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 11 and 17 are individually similar in scope to claim 5, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 12 and 18 are individually similar in scope to claim 6, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14, 20 and 27 are individually similar in scope to claim 8, and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

As per claim 29, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein the builder component is capable of creating a tree data structure expressed as JAVA (Kemper, Fig.4, col.8, line 32). However, Kemper does not teach the builder component capable of creating a tree data structure that embodies hierarchical relationships of nested XML statements. Chan teaches an interactive tool wherein the building of applications is capable of creating tree data structures using XML (Chan, para.002). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Chan's teaching with Kemper's tool in order to accommodate other types of files.

7. Claims 7 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper et al. ("Kemper", US 6,804,682) in view of Timbol (US 6,237,135).

As per claim 7, Kemper teaches the interactive tool wherein the hierarchical representation can include information pertaining to JAVA (Kemper, col.8, line 32). However, Kemper does not explicitly teach the information to pertain to at least one of: a Java archive

(JAR), a Web Archive (WAR), an Enterprise Archive (EAR), and a Java Connector Architecture Component (RAR). Timbol teaches an interactive tool for manipulating a file wherein the hierarchical representation can include information pertaining to a Java archive (Timbol, col.10, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Timbol's teaching with Kemper's tool in order to accommodate other types of files.

Claim 26 is similar in scope to claim 7, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper et al. ("Kemper", US 6,804,682) and Chan et al. ("Chan", US 2003/0028364) in view of Timbol (US 6,237,135).

As per claim 13, the interactive tool of Kemper and Chan teaches the interactive tool wherein the hierarchical representation can include information pertaining to JAVA (Kemper, col.8, line 32). However, the interactive tool of Kemper and Chan does not explicitly teach the information to pertain to at least one of: a Java archive (JAR), a Web Archive (WAR), an Enterprise Archive (EAR), and a Java Connector Architecture Component (RAR). Timbol teaches an interactive tool for manipulating a file wherein the hierarchical representation can include information pertaining to a Java archive (Timbol, col.10, lines 24-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include Timbol's teaching with the interactive tool of Kemper and Chan in order to accommodate other types of files.

Claim 19 is similar in scope to claim 13, and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 07/02/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

- a) Kemper provides no indication of the deployment descriptor that contains the deployment information that describes run-time parameters particular to a given web server implementation, configuration information for application objects and can be used by the builder to build the logical hierarchy of resources.
- b) Kemper does not teach the tree data structure that embodies hierarchical relationships of nested XML statements.
- c) Kemper does not teach the master tree data structure and the new tree data structure.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per a), Kemper does teach the deployment descriptors to contain information describing run-time parameters and configuration information (col.13, lines 49-66).

Per b), In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Chan teaches the use of XML statements.

Per c), Kemper does teach the updating of sources files based on the current state with the comparison of a master or original file to a new parsed tree (col.14, lines 58-67; col.23, line 64- col.24, line 7).

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communications

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sajeda Muhebbullah whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4065**. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday/Thursday and alt. Mondays from 8:30 am to 5:00 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124.

The central fax number for the organization where correspondence for this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sajeda Muhebbullah
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2174
/S. M./

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178